

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,295	05/17/2005	Aleksander Resman	RG/G-33025A/Lek	9703
83721 7590 05/21/2010 Lek (Slovenia) - LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 187	1	ARNOLD, ERNST V		
Knoxville, TN 37901			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1616	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/521,295	RESMAN ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616		

		ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616					
The MAILING DATE of thi	s communication appe	ars on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	e address				
THE REPLY FILED 13 May 2010 FAILS	S TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITIO	N FOR ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rej application, applicant must timely application in condition for allowa	☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of 1 application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places t application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Reque for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
a) The period for reply expires 4 m	onths from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
 b) The period for reply expires on: (The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is check MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECT			VHEN THE FIRST REPLY W	AS FILED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 3 have been filled is the date for purposes of d under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply may reduce any earned patent term adjustm NOTICE OF APPEAL	propriate extension fee al Office action; or (2) as							
The Notice of Appeal was filed or date of filing the Notice of Appeal Since a Notice of Appeal has bee AMENDMENTS	(37 CFR 41.37(a)), or an	ny extension thereof (37 t	CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid di	smissal of the appeal.				
The proposed amendment(s) file (a) They raise new issues that				ed because				
(b) They raise the issue of new			(000 110 1 = 201011)					
(c) They are not deemed to pla appeal; and/or	ce the application in bett	er form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplif	ying the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional clai	ms without canceling a c	orresponding number of	finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation								
4. The amendments are not in com			f Non-Compliant Amendn	nent (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome to	he following rejection(s):			,				
 Newly proposed or amended cla non-allowable claim(s). 	m(s) would be all	owable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amer	dment canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the propinow the new or amended claims. The status of the claim(s) is (or w	would be rejected is prov		b) Will be entered and	an explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5.7-9.12-18 a</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consider								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence file because applicant failed to provid was not earlier presented. See 3	e a showing of good and							
The affidavit or other evidence file entered because the affidavit or o showing a good and sufficient rea	ther evidence failed to ov sons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections un and was not earlier pres	der appeal and/or appella ented. See 37 CFR 41.33	nt fails to provide a B(d)(1).				
 The affidavit or other evidence is REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION 		of the status of the clain	ns after entry is below or a	ittached.				
11. M The request for reconsideration		does NOT place the app	lication in condition for all	owance because:				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information D	isclosure Statement(e) (PTO/SR/08) Paner Note						
13. Other:	corocar o cratement(s). (TOTOLIOS, Tapel NO(8)	.—					

/Ernst V Arnold/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616 Continuation of 3. NOTE: Independent claim 1 now recites a humidity limitation and a particle size limitation that were not previously presented. Also the particle size is now limited to about 30 microns which changes the scope of the claim. Independent claim 20 now recites at least 10% of a second film forming agent which was not previously presented. These limitations require further search and consideration before a patentability determination can be made. Claim 20 recites "at least 10% of a second film-forming agent". There is no support in the specification as filled for "at least 10% of a second film-forming agent" and therefore this represents a new concept and is new matter. Original claim 15 recites: "the coating contains at least about 10% of a polymer having viscosity of up to about 15 mPas." Su does not provide support for the instant recitation.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While Applicant's amendments would overcome the 112 first paragraph new matter over the particle size and scope of enablement as well as the 112 second paragraph, however the other 112 first paragraph new matter rejection is maintained. With respect to the capsule, there is not ipsis verbis support for a capsule. A capsule carries with it a certain meaning in the pharmaceutical art. Applicant discloses in [0017] that is is difficult to encapsulate the micronized particles are coated with some film forming polymer to encapsulate them. In fact, in claim 20, a film coating is applied over the tablet core which is a form of encapsulation. In other words, the process of encapsulation does not necessarily mean the resulting product is a capsule or se. A capsule in the pharmaceutical arts is an enclosing structure that encloses a dose of medicine such as a hard or soft gelatin capsule. Nowhere in the specification as filed are such 'capsules' disclosed and thus this represents a new concept and is new matter. With respect to the 103 rejection, Applicant has a mended the claims with new limitation that require further search and consideration as, for example, the primary reference of Broad does not expressly teach drying to a final humidity of about 2.5%.

Respectfully, the claims will not be entered because they are not in condition for allowance for at least the reasons provided above.